

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated December 14, 2005. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended and Claims 2-10 and 12-20 have been maintained in their original form. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 2-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner indicated that there was lack of antecedent basis for the limitation "remote identification tag holder of claim 1." Applicant has amended claim 1 in order to provide such antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 2-7 are now in condition to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Independent Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,532,689 to Bueno ("Bueno") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,310,999 to Claus, et al. ("Claus").

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of, "a panic switch operable to receive a panic indication... wherein said transmitter transmits a panic signal when said panic indication is received." This limitation is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. For this reason, at least, Claim 1 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 2-10 depend from and further limit claim 1 and should therefore also be allowable.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE


S/N 10/613,173

Atty. Dkt. No. SVSN-26,380

Claim 11 has been amended to include the limitation of a "biometric input" and a "remote processor." As is recited in the amended claim, the "remote identification tag reader reads identification data from said identification tag and reads biometric data from said biometric input." The "remote processor calculates a hash of the biometric data" and the "transmitter transmits... said hash to said location receiver." The "location processor... compares said hash to a replicated hash." These newly added limitations are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. For this reason, at least, Claim 11 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 12-20 depend from and further limit claim 11 and should therefore also be allowable.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/SVSN-26,380 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant



David G. Woodral
Registration No. 57,277

P.O. Box 741715
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715
Tel: 972-479-0462
Fax: 972-479-0464
April 11, 2006

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE
S/N 10/613,173
Atty. Dkt. No. SVSN-26,380